

and two found guilty, and sentenced to pay a fine of £4, within thirty days, the security of Mr. Coombs, their counsel, and late of Newton, Ont., being taken for the payment of the same. The four are, I think, Canadians, who came here this summer. Since I last wrote, Governor McTavish has issued a proclamation, a copy of which I enclose. It is not quite correct, there being a fifth paragraph in the true copy, which protests against the retention of 'certain gentlemen from Canada with their families, and the compulsion used to make them retreat from the Territory.' A trader here who has had occasion to ship furs to the States, had to allow his bales to be examined by an officer of the Provisional Government before a passport could be obtained for them. Major Wallis, who is returning to Canada to join his regiment in case of a Fenian invasion, was not allowed to take his rifle with him, there being an order prohibiting the exportation of arms or ammunition. The Major, however, got a receipt for it.

"The president and secretary have apartments over the general office of the company in the Fort. About 60 men are still in possession, and are furnished with pemmican and flour from the company's stores, the competent authority giving receipts for such in the name of the Council. Little is known of Mr. McDougall's views about matters. He is still at Pembina, and seems determined to remain there."

## THE CANADIAN ILLUSTRATED NEWS.

MONTREAL, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 18, 1869.

"The condition of Ireland" has for the nine hundred and ninety-ninth time forced itself upon the attention of the Imperial Government, not in respect of proposed reforms merely, which have been much too long delayed, but in the rudimentary function of keeping the peace. Five thousand additional troops; the proclamation of a portion of the country under martial law; the proposal to endow the Executive with the authority to suspend the *Habeas Corpus* Act at pleasure—these, with other repressive precautions, already adopted or to be resorted to, march side by side with the development of the new scheme for adjusting the relations between landlord and tenant. The land question, which was the real Irish grievance, has been among the last to arrest the attention of the Government. Not but that much has been done of late years for the amelioration of the condition of the classes interested in land; but the main issue—the guarantee of the tenant for reasonable compensation for his improvements, and also for reasonable fixity of tenure—has not yet been reached. These two branches of the question ought fairly to be considered together, for without fixity of tenure no tenant has any substantial inducement to make improvements; and without compensation for these, even fixity of tenure would be of little value.

It is indeed cheering to be assured that the Government bill, so far as it has yet been sketched by the press, indicates a firm determination to give tenants full scope and fair reward for their enterprise, while at the same time the landlords will be amply protected in the exercise of every right of proprietorship which they can reasonably claim. But if it be supposed that this contemplated reform is to remove Irish discontent, then a great mistake will have been made. Of all things in the world that disgust the professional patriot, nothing sends the iron deeper into his soul than beneficent and intelligent legislation emanating from the Government which it is his supreme desire to overthrow. Every inequality abolished, every grievance removed, is so much of a reduction in his political stock in trade, and he fumes and rages all the more violently as he sees his substantial grounds for remonstrance destroyed. England, France, Italy—almost every country in Europe—has suffered from this sort of patriotism, which Dr. Johnson so aptly characterized as the "last refuge of a scoundrel." Ireland has her "scoundrels" now, and many of them, it is to be regretted, occupy positions which confer upon them an influence for evil that their own poor talents could never have acquired. When the suggestion to "tumble" landlords, in other words, to shoot them down, is received with approbation and shouts of "bravo" at a public meeting, it is evident that the spirit of lawlessness is rampant in the land. Much may be said in extenuation of a hasty expression uttered at a public gathering; much more, perhaps, might be conceded to the hyperbole so characteristic of Irish oratory. But when landlords are thus publicly threatened, and one of their class occasionally falls a victim to the execution of such a threat, there is no room left for doubt as to the unwelcome conclusion that these rampant "patriots" are poisoning the minds of the Irish people. The honours paid to the "Manchester martyrs," so-called, have been utilized by the agitators in bringing the people to believe that "killing is no murder;" that to shoot a landlord or his bailiff, or an officer in the execution of the law, is a patriotic work tending to the liberation of Ireland. The severe denunciation of this new laxity of thought by the Cardinal Archbishop of Dublin does not appear to have commanded the respect to which it was entitled, for hints more or less broadly given of the people taking the law into their own hands are being indulged in with unwonted frequency.

Two serious evils beyond the reach of legislative remedy have already been developed under these untoward influences. In the first place, the Irish agitators have persuaded themselves that the Reforms recently conceded to Ireland, and those now promised, are being extorted from England's fear. This has stimulated them to make fresh demands, and to declare that nothing will satisfy them short of Irish national independence. The acts of lawlessness and the terrorism under which the landlords are being brought, added to the taunts about England's being afraid to refuse what Ireland demands, have created a feeling of bitterness on the other side of the Channel, which, whether Irish agitators may believe it or not, will work no good for Ireland. At the very time when the British Legislature is going furthest in its effort to reconcile Irish legislation with Irish interest and feelings, the national antipathies are being warmed into stronger powers of repulsion. To "read the papers" one might be led to infer that the two peoples never hated each other more cordially than just at the time when they had set about readjusting former differences. So the work of conciliation is entered upon in a bad spirit, which grows worse as that work proceeds.

We wish there were reasonable grounds for believing that these manifestations of ill-temper on both sides are but the passing hot words incident to the settlement of a long pending difference, to be forgotten, or at least forgiven, when the occasion which called them forth had passed. But there is no such agreeable prospect. When Mr. Gladstone peremptorily declined to liberate the Fenian prisoners, or to be guided in his policy towards them by the threats of their sympathizers, the angry feeling which was brewing got vent on both sides. In Ireland the Tenant Right movement has been headed off by a demand for the unconditional surrender of the Fenians; and now there is a proposition that every labourer shall have an acre of ground and a free house! In England the popular sympathy with Ireland has been checked by these manifestations of lawlessness and desire for revolution; so that now the Government is likely to adopt a new line of policy. It is being taunted for its leniency by the organs of the extreme party in Ireland, and now it may be roused into determined action by its own conception of the magnitude of the difficulties which continued agitation cannot fail to create.

Mr. Gladstone will, no doubt, act with courage and discretion. He began his career as Premier with a solemn declaration to adopt a policy of justice towards Ireland. On the ground of justice he disestablished and disendowed the Church; on the ground of justice he proposes to deal with the land question; and on the ground of justice he will probably adopt sharp and decisive measures to check the lawless proceedings of the agitators and their dupes. Perhaps the most disheartening part of the Irish question is, that the success of Mr. Gladstone's policy in establishing just and equitable relations between all classes and creeds will not only not reconcile the extreme "nationalists," but will render them, if possible, more hostile to the British Government. But as the English Premier has educated the British public into the firm faith that the Government has a solemn obligation resting upon it to carry out his policy of justice, he is not likely to falter in his endeavours to discharge this obligation; and when on the one hand no outbreak of mob violence will postpone the proposed remedial legislation, on the other, its adoption will give the Government a clean conscience to act with firmness, and, if need be, severity, in maintaining the peace of the country and repressing sedition. When the Government has once fairly established its character for justice, it need no longer hesitate in repelling every attempt at intimidation.

The emphatic declaration in President Grant's message against a renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty, on the ground that the benefits conferred thereby would be enjoyed almost exclusively by Canada, has been endorsed in the House of Representatives by a vote of 129 to 42. Surely this ought to be sufficient to convince Canadians and Americans alike that reciprocity in trade, similar to that secured by the treaty of 1854, between the two countries, is out of the question so long as the present Republican party maintains its ascendancy, and so long as the existing system of taxation is maintained by the United States. It would be folly to expect a renewal of the treaty during President Grant's incumbency; or until American taxes more nearly approach the low rate antecedent to the war; and for the reason that the Americans hold to the doctrine that before a free exchange would be fair reciprocity, the taxes of the Canadian should be equalized with those of the American producer. As the interests of the producers are erroneously held to be paramount to those of the consumers, this consideration will outweigh with the American Government the advantages its people would derive from the cheapening of produce which would fol-

low its free admission from Canada; and hence all notion of obtaining reciprocity should be abandoned, at least until American ideas on trade undergo a radical change.

There are influences manifestly at work, however, to keep alive the expectation that something is to be done in the matter almost immediately. "Man never is, but always *to be* blessed;" reciprocity negotiations never do, but always are to come. These feints may be intended for the Canadian or the American market, or both. There are large interests in Canada which would benefit by reciprocity; the Canadian Government is understood to be especially favourable to its renewal. Are these rumours of coming negotiations set afloat from time to time to induce more active exertion from this side the line? Then, again, there are several special interests in the United States, powerful "rings," which spend money freely to regulate the tariff for their own benefit; are these hints thrown out to keep the tariff "lobby" at Washington in a flutter? Whatever the motive which prompts their being set afloat, they are utterly worthless in the face of the President's declaration, so emphatically confirmed by the House of Representatives.

Here is the latest despatch issued to give the project the semblance of life:—"The New York Tribune's Washington special says: The resolutions touching reciprocity which passed the House on Monday are said to mean nothing but a support of the President in condemning the old treaty, as the President says it may be necessary to have some regulations of a commercial character between the United States and the Provinces, and as Secretary Fish has invited, it is said, the Canadian authorities to a discussion of such regulations, many members who acted to sustain the resolution avow themselves in favour of a new treaty."

Are said, "it is said," &c., &c. The resolutions of the House "mean nothing," because the President said "it may be necessary to have some regulations of a commercial character with Canada!" Of course such regulations not only may be, but are necessary, and they already exist in a condition susceptible of great improvement for the mutual benefit of both countries, without at all touching the subject of reciprocity. The language of the President, like the resolution of the House, was sufficiently explicit against a renewal of reciprocity; while the "regulations," which he admitted might be desirable, evidently involve no change of tariff on either side. It will be a pity if any portion of the Canadian public should be diverted from trying to do the best for the development of the trade of this country independently of reciprocity; for, however thoroughly we may be all convinced that the American policy is injurious to American interests, we must be equally satisfied that for the present the Government and people are wedded to it; and that these irresponsible telegraphic rumours, from time to time issued to the contrary, are worthless, unless as means to excite the lobbies. The one we have now quoted is surely too transparent a sham to receive credence in any well-informed quarter.

### ART EDUCATION.

Though the more remunerative rewards for labour in this country may render attention to technical and art education less immediately pressing than in the older countries of Europe, yet, that attention, if well bestowed in time, would be no less productive of beneficial results. The careless, slipshod system of agriculture followed in many parts of Canada, has increased the country's wealth, and made its people prosperous, yet there cannot be a doubt that a more scientific mode of culture; the study of the soils; their restoration to the highest state of productiveness by the application of suitable manures; the use of the best mechanical appliances in planting, cultivating and gathering the crops, would have added very much to the wealth of the country and the happiness of its people. Had good farming been the rule, instead of the exception, the duty of the statesman in providing "Ways and Means," would have been lightened, and the people, through the increased wealth acquired, would have had the means of greater and more varied enjoyments within their reach. It is universally admitted that even in the most ordinary employment, the educated labourer, other things being equal, is the superior workman. And when the finer kinds of handicraft come to be considered; when work which requires delicacy of touch, steadiness of nerve, and the most perfect control of the muscles, has to be done, then not only long but early training is an essential to the workman who would achieve success.

Many writers have lately commented upon the decadence of British skill in the commercial arts; or, rather upon the growing superiority of continental workmanship when contrasted with British, and the reason almost invariably given for this, is the better education bestowed upon the labourer on the continent, at the time when he is most susceptible of acquiring either manual or artistic skill. "The British workman," it is said, "is a mere machine;" he has only been taught in the factory, the foundry, the ship-yard, the mine, or the workshop, to do some particular branch of work, the adaptability of